

Serial No.: 09/715,054

REMARKS

Claims 1-11, as amended, and new claims 12-15 are before the Examiner for consideration.

Applicants appreciate the statements in the Office Action that claims 7-10 are allowed, and that claims 2-5 would be allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the independent claim and any intervening claims. It is respectfully submitted for reasons appearing below that all pending claims are allowable.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite steps in the method of successively receiving a plurality of video images, and recording a first one of the video images received at a first time and a second one of the video images received at a second time later than the first time (see applicants' specification, page 6, lines 11-14); wherein a thinning rate for the first one of the recorded video images is higher than a thinning rate for a second one of the recorded video images (see applicants' specification, page 7, lines 20-22; page 8, lines 9-12, and page 9, lines 8-14). Claim 11, which has been amended to depend from

Serial No.: 09/715,054

allowed claim 7, also is allowable. Editorial changes have been made in claims 1-11. New claims 12-14, depending ultimately from claim 1, and claim 15, depending from claim 7, have been added. See applicants' specification, page 11, line 14, to page 12, line 15, where support for the new method claims. New claim 15 depending from allowed claim 7 is allowable also.

1. Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claim 11 has been amended to depend from claim 7, thereby mooting the rejection. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

2. Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Yoshinori et al. JP 40-8009332. The claim patentably defines thereon.

The presently claimed method includes steps of successively receiving a plurality of video images and recording a first one of the video images received at a first time and a second one of the video images received at a second time later than the first time, and thinning each of the recorded video images to form

Serial No.: 09/715,054

thinned video images, wherein a thinning rate for the first one of the recorded video images is higher than a thinning rate for a second one of the recorded video images. A method having such steps is nowhere disclosed or suggested in the cited reference.

In operation, the presently claimed method uses a circuit 204 for thinning recorded data as a thinned video image 311. A video image 315 and the former thinned video image 311 are thinned by circuit 204 as thinned video images 316 and 322. Circuits 204 and 206 thin a video image first at a rate of $1/n$ and secondly at a total thinning rate of $1/m$ ($n < m$). For example, a video image is thinned at a rate of $1/2$, $1/4$, or $1/8$, as described in applicants' specification, page 7, lines 20-22; page 8, lines 9-12, and page 9, lines 8-14.

Yoshinori et al. JP '332 discloses thinning a recorded video image over time and outputting the thinned image, by thinning out a recorded video signal and then reading to form a $1/n$ division display image pattern. However, Yoshinori et al. JP '332 does not teach recording a first one of the video images received at a first time and a second one of the video images received at a second time later than the first time, thinning

Serial No.: 09/715,054

each of the recorded video images to form thinned video images, wherein a thinning rate for the first one of the recorded video images is higher than a thinning rate for a second one of the recorded video images, as recited in applicants' claim 1.

For the foregoing reasons, Yoshinori et al. JP '332 fails to disclose all elements of applicants' claimed invention, and therefore is not a proper basis for rejection under §102. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

2. Claims 6 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yoshinori et al. JP '332 in view of Official Notice. Claim 11 has been amended to depend from allowed claim 7, thereby mooting its rejection.

Claim 6, which depends from claim 1, is allowable for the same reasons given above that claim 1 is allowable.

Moreover, the Examiner acknowledges that Yoshinori et al. JP '332 does not show generating time data and attaching such time data to each frame of a video image but asserts that such steps are known in the art. The rejection falls because Yoshinori et

Serial No.: 09/715,054


al. JP '332 does not disclose or suggest that a thinning rate for the first one of the recorded video images is higher than a thinning rate for a second one of the recorded video images, as recited in applicants' claim 1 from which claim 6 depends. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action by the applicants would be desirable to place this application in even better condition for immediate allowance, the Examiner is requested to telephone applicants' undersigned representatives.

Respectfully submitted,

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.

February 10, 2005
Date


Charles A. Wendel
Registration No. 24,453
Robert N. Wieland
Registration No. 40,225

CAW:RNW/mhs
Attorney Docket No.: PADE:054

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.
1421 Prince Street, Suite 210
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-2805
Telephone: (703) 739-0220